

09/766,780

4

P-5686U1-D1

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1 to 18 are currently pending, claims 10 to 18 have been canceled, and claim 1 has been amended.

The Office Action mailed April 21, 2004 addressed claims 1 to 18. Claims 1 to 18 were rejected.

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) for failing to show a multiple layer cover. The Examiner stated that any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing, and a proposed drawing correction is required. The Examiner compared Figures 3 and 4 with specification page 40.

Applicants respectfully disagree. The specification at page 40 (lines 16 to 35) describes figures 3 and 4 as having a multi-layer cover. Specifically, the specification refers to figure 3 and describes a "multi-layer cover 34 surrounds the core 30 and the core layer 32", and the multi-layer cover 34 is shown in Figure 3. Similarly, the description of Figure 4 states a "multi-layer cover 44 surrounds the core 40 and the core layer 42". Both figures further describe the multi-layer cover as preferably corresponding to the previously described multi-layer cover 12. Applicants respectfully submit that it is clear from the specification that the cover 44 is a multi-layer cover, and it is more clearly shown by referring to the previously described multi-layer cover 12, which consists of an inner cover 14 and an outer cover 16. Therefore, the drawings as filed show a cover, which is a multi-layer cover, as described in the specification. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection to the drawings.

Claims 1 to 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner stated that the claim(s) contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The Examiner

09/766,780

5

P-5686U1-D1

concluded that the specification does not disclose a cover "consisting" of a single cover layer.

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner, in an effort to hasten prosecution, claim 1 has been amended to state that the cover "includes" a single cover layer, as originally filed. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1 to 9 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1 to 4 and 6 to 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamagishi et al. (5,688,595). The Examiner stated that regarding claim 1, Yamagishi discloses a golf ball comprising a dual core and a single outer cover, and the dual core comprises a center component and a core layer. The Examiner further stated that the center component is made from a thermoset material and the core layer is made from a thermoplastic material, and the outer cover layer has a Shore D hardness from 40 to 60. The Examiner further stated that regarding claims 2, 4 and 6, the thermoset material for the core component is a polybutadiene and the thermoplastic material for the core layer is an ionomer; regarding claim 3, the core may comprise at least two layers; regarding claim 7, the center component has a diameter from 0.787 to 1.535 inches and the core component and core layer have a diameter from 1.378 to 1.614 inches; and regarding claims 8 and 9, Yamagishi discloses a variety of inert fillers that may be added to the core layers that are commonly known for increasing/decreasing density.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner. Yamagishi et al. is directed to a solid golf ball having a dual core and a soft multi-layer cover where the inner cover layer is softer than the outer cover layer to provide a soft feel and good spin and distance. Yamagishi specifically discloses that the inner cover layer must be softer than the outer cover layer. Applicants respectfully submit that contrary to the assertions of the Examiner, Yamagishi does not disclose a golf ball comprising a dual core and a single cover layer, as claimed by Applicants.

Since Yamagishi does not disclose each and every element of Applicants' claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Yamagishi does not anticipate claim 1. Claims 2 to 4 and 6 to 9 depend from claim 1 and therefore are also not anticipated by

09/766,780

6

P-5686U1-D1

Yamagishi. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1 to 4 and 6 to 9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamagishi et al. (5,688,595) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 10 to 13 and 15 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagishi et al. (5,688,595) in view of Maruko et al. (5,752,888) or Maruko (5,792,009).

Claims 10 to 18 have been canceled by this Amendment. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 10 to 13 and 15 to 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Yamagishi et al. (5,688,595) in view of Maruko et al. (5,752,888) or Maruko (5,792,009) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagishi et al. (5,688,595) in view of Maruko et al. (5,752,888) or Maruko (5,792,009) as applied to claims 1 to 4, 6 to 13 and 15 to 18 above and further in view of Wu (5,334,673). The Examiner stated that Yamagishi in view of Maruko discloses the invention as shown above but does not include polyurethane as an option for the thermoset material (core component), but Wu teaches a polyurethane golf ball product suitable for the core layer. The Examiner concluded that one skilled in the art would have modified the invention of Yamagishi in view of Maruko by including a polyurethane core component to improve the resiliency of the golf ball.

As discussed above regarding claim 1, Yamagishi does not disclose the invention because Yamagishi does not disclose a golf ball comprising a dual core and a single cover layer. Therefore, the addition of Wu for a polyurethane core component also does not disclose the invention of claim 5. Claim 14 has been canceled by this Amendment.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 5 and 14 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Yamagishi et al. (5,688,595) in view of Maruko et al. (5,752,888) or Maruko (5,792,009) as applied to claims 1 to 4, 6 to 13 and 15 to 18 above, and further in view of Wu (5,334,673). Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 5 and 14 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

09/766,780

7

P-5686U1-D1

The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney if it is deemed that a telephone conversation will hasten prosecution of the application.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of each of the presently rejected claims, claims 1 to 18. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 1 to 9, the claims currently pending.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL J. SULLIVAN ET AL.

Customer No. 24492
Phone: (413) 322-2937

Date: June 28, 2004

By: Michelle Bugbee
Michelle Bugbee, Reg. No. 42,370
The Top-Flite Golf Company
A wholly-owned subsidiary of Callaway Golf Company
Attorney for Applicants
425 Meadow Street, P.O. Box 901
Chicopee, MA 01021-0901

cc: Richard M. Klein, Esquire (SLD 2 0106-2)